

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

#### ABORTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, 2 years ago, the Senate Democratic leader rallied a crowd on the steps of the Supreme Court and threatened Justices by name if they did not resolve an abortion case the way he wanted. Here was the quote:

I want to tell you, Gorsuch; I want to tell you, Kavanaugh: You have released the whirlwind, and you will pay the price. You won't know what hit you if you go forward with these awful decisions.

This incitement triggered rare public rebukes from the Chief Justice himself and even the liberal American Bar Association. But, apparently, the radical left heard their marching orders loud and clear.

Since the precedent-setting leak of a draft opinion last week, the left has set out to harass and intimidate sitting judges as they consider a pending case. We have seen angry crowds assemble at Justices' private family homes. Activists publish a map of their addresses. Law enforcement has had to install a security fence around the Supreme Court itself.

Trying—trying—to scare Federal judges into ruling a certain way is far outside the bounds of First Amendment speech or protest; it is an attempt to replace the rule of law with the rule of mobs.

It appears this may possibly be flatout illegal. There is a Federal law on the books that criminalizes “pickets or parades with the intent of influencing any judge, juror, witness, or court officer” at locations—listen to this—that include a judge’s “residence.”

Last year, Attorney General Garland’s Justice Department was quick to treat the concerned parents of America like potential domestic terrorists. But, curiously, I haven’t heard any announcement about how the DOJ may handle these intimidation tactics aimed directly at Federal judges.

Washington Democrats have gone out of their way to fuel the hysterical, potentially dangerous, climate. The President’s statement about the unprecedented leak didn’t condemn it. His Press Secretary has repeatedly appeared to endorse rallies at judge’s private family residences as long as they don’t turn into outright violence.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts stood on the Supreme Court steps and shouted:

We are gonna fight back.

Democrats are renewing their calls to break the Senate in order to pack the Court. They want to destroy two institutions for the price of one.

One liberal Georgetown law professor helpfully summarized their mission as follows: He explained this past weekend that the key moral difference between this pressure campaign and the Janu-

ary 6 riot is that, in this case—now listen to this—“the mob is right.”

So what has generated this reckless outrage? What is the Armageddon over which Democrats want to break the Senate, pack the Court, and condone potentially illegal rallies outside judges’ family homes? Here is the case in question: whether the State of Mississippi can enact an abortion law that would still be more liberal—more liberal—than laws in Germany, France, and Switzerland.

This is the case that is driving these hysterics, the possibility that abortion laws might begin to move away from China and North Korea and closer to Germany, France, and Switzerland? That is what has prompted the calls to destroy our institutions and surround Justices’ family homes. That is why a pro-life nonprofit in Wisconsin got a Molotov cocktail through its window and activists called for disruptions of Sunday worship.

Today’s Democratic Party is profoundly out of step with the American people on this issue. Their extreme position ignores modern science and public opinion.

Leader SCHUMER wants the Senate to vote again on a Democratic bill that would effectively legalize abortion-on-demand through all 9 months. Their bill is written to protect abortionists rather than mothers. It would roll back health regulations. It would attack America’s conscience rights and religious freedoms. It would overturn modest and overwhelmingly popular safeguards like waiting periods, informed consent laws, and possibly even parental notification. And it is written so that, in practice, it would allow elective abortion until birth.

Democrats’ extreme position is radical on a global scale and wildly unpopular with the American people. Only 34 percent of Americans believe abortion should be legal in all or most cases into the second trimester. That drops to 19 percent in the third trimester, but that is what the Democrats’ bill would allow in practice.

Every Senate Democrat but two and every House Democrat except a handful has put their name on this as cosponsors. That means 97 percent of Washington Democrats support a position that only 19 percent of Americans actually want. I will say that again. Ninety-seven percent of Democrats in Congress are cosponsors of an outcome that has 19 percent public support.

Notwithstanding inflation, energy insecurity, open borders, a violent crime-wave, and a war in Europe, Democrats want to spend this week explaining their extremism. Some Democrats even want to try again to break the Senate in order to ram this through. I have clearly stated I will never, never support smashing the legislative filibuster on this issue or any other. Yet Democrats want to wreck our institutions over their fringe position that Americans do not share.

I can understand why my colleagues want to distract from their governing

record. Their policies have created a living nightmare for working families. But Democrats’ extreme and unpopular position on abortion is not going to bail them out. It just gives Americans yet another reminder that the radicals are running the show.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. DUCKWORTH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 848.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Alvaro M. Bedoya, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2019.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 848, Alvaro M. Bedoya, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2019.

Charles E. Schumer, Jacky Rosen, Cory A. Booker, Elizabeth Warren, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patty Murray, Brian Schatz, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Alex Padilla, Amy Klobuchar, Tina Smith, Jeff Merkley, Jack Reed, Angus S. King, Jr., Chris Van Hollen, John W. Hickenlooper, Richard J. Durbin.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

#### WOMEN’S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT OF 2022—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to legislative session.